



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

hope of the individual Christian in terms of a resurrection at the time of the Parousia. Those who die in the meantime "sleep." But in II Cor. chap. 5 and Phil. chap. 1, we find the notion that one passes into fellowship with the heavenly Christ immediately after death. Several interpreters have found here a fundamental change in Paul's position. In the earlier passages his view is Jewish, defining the future hope in terms of bodily resurrection and judgment, while his later view is thought to show an appropriation of Greek ideas which defined the future hope as immediate immortality for the soul. Deissner rejects these views claiming that Paul's thought never underwent any fundamental change, since his hope in both the earlier and the later passages rests ultimately upon his doctrine of the spirit. The ground of hope is the believer's spiritual fellowship with the risen Jesus—the believer is in Christ, Christ is in him, and the union endures beyond death since Christ has triumphed over death. Thus Paul made no essential change when he thought of this union as existing immediately after death. His elimination of the notion of a brief period of sleep was a natural consequence of his own later conviction that he himself must face death. Then he feels that fellowship with Christ cannot be broken even for a brief period. Accordingly Deissner finds Paul to have been uninfluenced by Greek philosophy; his doctrine of the future life is a product of his own experience.

Perhaps it is not strange that our author should have been content to mention the Stoics as the only possible source of Hellenistic influence upon Paul. It certainly has not been the custom to look for light elsewhere, but is it not remarkable, when Deissner defines Paul's hope so fundamentally in terms of fellowship with a dying and rising redeemer, that it should not have occurred to him to compare Paul's faith with the similar idea taught by the Mystery-religions?

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE JOHANNINE STUDIES OF CLEMEN AND B. WEISS

The recent appearance of two volumes on the Fourth Gospel¹ reminds us that this New Testament book still presents a large number of very difficult problems. The literary unity, the authorship, the

¹ *Die Entstehung des Johannesevangeliums*. Von Carl Clemen. Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1912. viii+493 pages. M. 14.

Das Johannesevangelium als einheitliches Werk geschichtlich erklärt. Von Bernhard Weiss. Berlin: Trowitzsch u. Sohn, 1912. xv+365 pages.

purpose, the date and place of composition, the historical reliability are all questions which have of late been answered quite differently by different scholars. Of these two latest discussions, Clemen surveys the whole field, while Weiss is chiefly concerned with the problem of literary unity.

Clemen's volume is, in the first place, a valuable compendium of the literature—both German and foreign—of the subject. The author never tires of stating the opinions of other scholars. This is a valuable feature of his work, yet a reader must guard against supposing that the problems are to be solved by summarizing current opinions rather than by a first-hand examination of the original data. In the introduction recent theories about the gospel's literary origin and reliability are examined. The evidence is thought to be against any hypothesis of a *Grundschrift*, later extensively redacted. Rather, we have a single author employing various traditions whose form had been partially determined beforehand through oral tradition. As for the historicity of the gospel, its framework and manner of presenting Jesus' teaching are held to be largely the evangelists' own creation, yet he availed himself of some genuine traditions which supplement and even correct the synoptic data.

Clemen's main discussion (pp. 48-348) is a defense of these theses by a detailed examination of the gospel's contents, subdivided into three main sections: chaps. 1-6, 7-12, and 13-20. Chap. 21 is an appendix, but the rest of the book is found to be a literary unit. Though in general a free composition, it has more complete topographical details than the Synoptic Gospels (e.g., 4:6 ff.; 5:2; 19:20, 42); it has additional information about certain persons who came into contact with Jesus (e.g., 1:28, 44 ff.; 3:23; 6:71; 13:26; 19:25; 21:2) it tells of new incidents in Jesus' career (e.g., 2:1 ff.); it gives a more original form of some of Jesus' sayings (e.g., 12:25; cf. Matt. 10:39; Luke 17:33), and John 12:16 is more accurate than the synoptic narrative in depicting the disciples' attitude toward the "Triumphal Entry." Yet on the whole this gospel has greater historical worth as a source of information for the evolution of early Christianity than as a source for the life and teaching of Jesus.

Finally the problems of provenance, date, and origin are discussed. Asia is fixed upon as the place of origin, between the years 94 and 115. The author was not John the apostle, though the latter had resided in Asia during the later years of his life and had been the exponent of the type of Christianity which is exemplified in the Fourth Gospel. In fact this work was most probably written by one of his pupils who was him-

self a Jew by birth and an admirer of the apostle, from whom he had derived some first-hand information about Jesus.

In its general attitude the work of Weiss is much the same as Clemen's, though attention is centered upon the literary problem. Criticism is directed chiefly against Spitta's *Das Johannesevangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu* (Göttingen, 1910), which distinguishes a *Grundschrift* and two somewhat extensive redactions in our present gospel. Wellhausen and Wendt also come in for a share of criticism. In fact Weiss thinks that all attempts at literary analysis are vain. Moreover, the Tübingen hypothesis, that the gospel is primarily a tendency writing without any serious historical intention, is rejected. The evangelist, it is conceded, composed his narrative in a free manner and was strongly influenced by the theological notions of his time, yet he availed himself of ancient tradition and he felt his work to be of a historical character. He never, however, copied sources literally, and so the primitive elements in his gospel cannot be discovered by any elaborate scheme of literary analysis. It is left for exegesis alone, by a careful study of the writer's thought, to discover where he betrays dependence upon earlier tradition and where he superimposed his own ideas.

With this end in view, Weiss goes through the gospel, verse by verse, giving a detailed exposition. His study issues in the conviction that one unifying purpose runs through all the material, notwithstanding the breaks in continuity and the inner contradictions sometimes observed. The author's first interest was not to record a series of events; his work throughout was a *Lehr- and Erbauungsschrift*, intended for use within the community or in missionary work. He felt that the chief need of the community was not orientation in the details of Jesus' life but edifying facts about the earthly Jesus in order to stimulate a living faith in the exalted and glorified Christ. Hence historical incidents were narrated only incidentally, as a means of demonstrating the significance of Jesus' person and work. With this interest uppermost the evangelist was not always particular to ascertain the exact words of Jesus, or to keep strict historical continuity in narrating the course of events. In fact, some, times he was so careless as to contradict himself. These features are incidental to his method and so are no sufficient ground, as Spitta, Wellhausen, and other analysts have assumed, for an extensive literary analysis of the book.

Yet the gospel is more truly historical than, for example, the Tübingen critics supposed. The writer was not an apologist, writing to create tradition for tradition's own sake; nor was he a historical critic in the

modern sense of the term. His interest in history was so completely subordinate to his interest in edification that he freely idealized tradition, making no effort to copy available sources closely nor yet intentionally perverting his sources. When he wrote tradition was in a fluid state, and was no doubt reported differently by different persons. Thus he felt quite free to interpret the tradition, whether it was a matter of his own personal recollection or was derived from a source, in line with the edifying intention of his work. Whether the author was an eye-witness or not is, therefore, not a fundamental consideration for the question of either literary unity or historicity. The item of first importance is the author's purpose. And exegetical study of the gospel shows, according to Weiss, that this is such as to prohibit the copying of original documents by him; and an understanding of his purpose also enables us to distinguish to some extent between what is the product of his fancy and what he derived from more reliable tradition.

This insistence upon literary unity—a point upon which Clemen and Weiss agree—is very timely in view of the recent advocacy of partition theories by Schwartz, Wellhausen, Spitta, and Wendt. The impression of unity which the gospel makes, so far as its pragmatic interest is concerned, is certainly striking, and is a strong argument against the analysts.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BROOKE'S COMMENTARY ON THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES¹

In this new volume of the "International Critical Commentary" Mr. Brooke has provided a remarkably complete apparatus for the study of the Johannine epistles. In addition to the commentary proper and an introduction much fuller than is usual in the series, he supplies an appendix in which the attempt is made to reconstruct the Old Latin version, and a set of very useful indices, analyzing the vocabulary of the epistles and comparing it with that of the Fourth Gospel.

The commentary proper is clear, concise, and scholarly; and has the quality, not often found in commentaries, of being readable and interesting. It is sufficiently full on all matters of detail, but does not submerge the larger questions of interpretation under a mass of mere grammatical and textual discussion. The more outstanding difficulties

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles.* By Rev. A. E. Brooke, Dean and Divinity Lecturer, King's College, Cambridge. New York: Scribner, 1912. xc+242 pages. \$2.50.